

REMARKS

Claims 1-27 are pending in the present application. By this amendment, claims 1-3, 11, 13, 18, and 20-21 are amended. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present claims in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

I. Prior Art Rejections

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1-9 and 11-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 5,896,321 to Miller et al. (hereinafter “Miller”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As amended, claim 1 recites that a method for correcting text input into a text document comprises after displaying the list of alternatives, receiving an edit to the erroneous text component directly into the erroneous text component in the text document, the edit comprising a partial entry of a desired alterative to the erroneous text component; filtering the list of alternatives in response to the edit to remove alternatives not associated with the partial entry; in response to filtering the list of alternatives, displaying a revised list of alternatives containing alternatives associated with the partial entry.

Miller does not disclose a method for correcting text input into a text document as recited by claim 1. On the contrary, Miller discloses a text completion system that monitors the receipt of a string of characters into a program module; determines whether a partial data entry, which is defined as the contiguous characters received since the last delimiter character, satisfies certain search criteria; if so, obtains a prioritized list of word predictions from the word prediction system; and displays the completion suggestions in priority order in a list box on the LCD display. However, Miller fails to disclose that after displaying the completion suggestions in the list box, receiving an edit to the partial data entry, which the Office Action equates to the erroneous text component, directly into the partial data entry in the text document such that the edit comprises a partial entry of a desired alterative to the partial data entry. Miller also fails to disclose that in response to the edit, the list box is filtered to remove completion suggestion alternatives not associated with the partial entry, and in response to filtering the list box, a revised list box

of completion suggestion alternatives containing alternatives associated with the partial entry is displayed. Instead, Miller discloses that after displaying the completion suggestions in the list box, a user may enter an acceptance command to select one of the suggestions, and then the text completion system completes the partial data entry with the additional characters of the selected completion suggestion and discontinues the display of the list box containing the completion suggestions. Therefore, Miller fails to disclose the method recited by claim 1.

For at least the reasons given above, Miller does not anticipate claim 1. Since claims 2-9 and 11-12 depend from claim 1 and recite additional features, Applicants respectfully submit that Miller does not anticipate Applicants' claimed invention as embodied in claims 2-9 and 11-12 for at least these reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

As amended, claim 13 recites that a method for correcting text input into a text document comprises after displaying the list of alternatives, receiving an edit to the erroneous text component directly into the erroneous text component in the text document, the edit comprising a partial entry of a desired alternative to the erroneous text component; filtering the list of alternatives in response to the edit to remove alternatives not associated with the partial entry; in response to filtering the list of alternatives, displaying a revised list of alternatives containing alternatives associated with the partial entry; if, in response to filtering the list of alternatives, no acceptable alternative to the erroneous text component is identified, receiving additional edits to the erroneous text component directly into the erroneous text component in the text document to further filter the list of alternatives in response to the additional edits; and after receiving each of the additional edits, displaying a further revised list of alternatives containing alternatives associated with an entry comprised of the edit and the additional edits.

Miller does not disclose a method for correcting text input into a text document as recited by claim 13. Instead, as discussed above, Miller discloses a text completion system that determines whether an entered partial data entry satisfies certain search criteria, and if so, obtains a prioritized list of word predictions from the word prediction system which is then displayed in a list box on the LCD display. However, Miller fails to disclose that after displaying the completion suggestions in the list box, receiving an edit

to the partial data entry directly into the partial data entry in the text document such that the edit comprises a partial entry of a desired alterative to the partial data entry. Miller also fails to disclose that in response to the edit to remove alternatives not associated with the partial entry, the completion suggestions are filtered; and in response to filtering, a revised list of completion suggestions containing alternatives associated with the partial entry is displayed. Further, Miller fails to disclose that if no acceptable completion suggestion alternative to the partial data entry is identified in the filtered list box, then additional edits to the partial data entry are received directly into the partial data entry in the text document to further filter the list of completion suggestion alternatives in response to the additional edits; and after receiving each of the additional edits, displaying a further revised list of alternative completion suggestions containing alternatives associated with an entry comprised of the edit and the additional edits. Instead, Miller discloses that after displaying the completion suggestions in the list box, a user may enter an acceptance command to select one of the suggestions, and then the text completion system completes the partial data entry with the additional characters of the selected completion suggestion and discontinues the display of the list box containing the completion suggestions.

For at least the reasons given above, Miller does not anticipate claim 13. Since claims 14-19 depend from claim 13 and recite additional features, Applicants respectfully submit that Miller does not anticipate Applicants' claimed invention as embodied in claims 14-19 for at least these reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

As amended, claim 20 recites that a method for correcting text input into a text document comprises after displaying the list of alternatives, receiving an edit to the erroneous text component directly into the erroneous text component in the text document, the edit comprising a partial entry of a desired alterative to the erroneous text component; filtering the list of alternatives in response to the edit to remove alternatives not associated with the partial entry; and in response to filtering the list of alternatives, displaying a revised list of alternatives containing alternatives associated with the partial entry.

Miller does not disclose a method for correcting text input into a text document as recited by claim 20. In contrast, Miller discloses a text completion system that determines whether an entered partial data entry satisfies certain search criteria, and if so, obtains a prioritized list of word predictions from the word prediction system which is then displayed in a list box on the LCD display. However, Miller fails to disclose that after displaying the completion suggestions in the list box, receiving an edit to the partial data entry directly into the partial data entry in the text document such that the edit comprises a partial entry of a desired alternative to the partial data entry. Miller also fails to disclose that in response to the edit, the list box is filtered to remove alternatives not associated with the partial entry, and in response to filtering the list box, a revised list box of alternatives containing alternatives associated with the partial entry is displayed. Instead, Miller discloses that after displaying the completion suggestions in the list box, a user may enter an acceptance command to select one of the suggestions, and then the text completion system completes the partial data entry with the additional characters of the selected completion suggestion and discontinues the display of the list box containing the completion suggestions. Therefore, Miller fails to disclose the method recited by claim 20.

For at least the reasons given above, Miller does not anticipate claim 20. Since claims 21-27 depend from claim 20 and recite additional features, Applicants respectfully submit that Miller does not anticipate Applicants' claimed invention as embodied in claims 21-27 for at least these reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller in view of United States Patent No. 6,438,523 to Oberteuffer et al. (hereinafter "Oberteuffer"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

For at least the reasons stated above, claim 1 is patentable over Miller. Since claim 10 depends from claim 1 and recites additional features, Applicants respectfully submit that the combined teaching of Miller and Oberteuffer does not make obvious claim 10. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

RECEIVED

FEB 12 2004

Technology Center 2100



CONCLUSION

For at least these reasons, Applicants assert that the pending claims 1-27 are in condition for allowance. Applicants further assert that this response addresses each and every point of the Office Action, and respectfully request that the Examiner pass this application with claims 1-27 to allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions, please contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at 404.954.5042.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD, LLC

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Murrell W. Blackburn".

Date: February 6, 2004

Murrell W. Blackburn
Reg. No. 50,881

MERCHANT & GOULD, LLC
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
(404) 954.5100

27488

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE